



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,197	07/02/2003	Chie Ohba	AA537C	4114
27752	7590	02/04/2009	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			STEPHENSON, JACQUELINE F	
Global Legal Department - IP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor				
299 East Sixth Street			3761	
CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/04/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,197	Applicant(s) OHBA, CHIE
	Examiner Jacqueline F. Stephens	Art Unit 3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/7/08.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/7/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant repeats the argument that Lassen does not provide an interlabial device such that the entire absorbent interlabial device resides within an interlabial space. Applicant also notes that the Office Action has not provided any evidence that the device of Lassen can be folded small enough to fit within the interlabial space of a user nor has the Office provided motivation for why one skilled in the art would be motivated to reduce the size of Lasses to provide a smaller pad. Applicant submits that the claimed invention is not merely a change in dimension of the interlabial device of Lasses and the interlabial device of the present invention is important to its comfort and effectiveness. The Examiner maintains that Lassen meets the structural limitations of the present invention except for the exact dimensions. The invention of Lassen is used for the same purpose and in the same manner as the present invention. The interlabial pad of Lassen is taught as requiring only partial insertion. However, as previously argued, the structure of Lassen does not prevent the entire absorbent interlabial device from being able to be placed inside an interlabial space of a wearer. The interlabial device is capable of fitting within an interlabial region of a user, particularly if the device is folded. One having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to fold a pad any pad, to provide additional protection in a specific area or for a tighter fit. Additionally, how the article will fit on a user is relative to the size of the user. As to the claimed dimensions, as previously argued, the fact that Lassen teaches a larger pad that resides

outside of the interlabial space is a matter of function rather than structure. The claimed subject matter is relative to the dimensions of the pad. The examiner maintains that Lassen teaches an interlabial device similar to the claimed invention. One having ordinary skill in the art would be able through routine experimentation to determine the appropriate size of any portion or all of the interlabial pad in accordance with the intended use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lassen USPN 4631062.

As to claims 1-4, 10, 11, 13, and 14, Lassen discloses an interlabial absorbent device having a liquid permeable topsheet 80 on a body facing side and a liquid impermeable backsheet 70 on a garment facing side, with an interior region 64 and periphery region (58,60,62), with an absorbent 74 disposed between the garment and body facing sides in a layered arrangement. Lassen does not disclose the specific dimensions of the pad. Lassen does teach the relative dimensions in a functional sense

are at least long enough to extend over the desire areas in use (col. 11, lines 28-35). One would be motivated by the teaching of Lassen to provide a pad with the claimed dimensions for allowing the pad to fit the body contours of a wearer with the need for external attachment to a panty in order to minimize the irritability and friction, which Lassen teaches is desired (col.I 6, lines 9-16). In *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, "where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device".

The interlabial device has a concave portion on the garment facing side and a convex portion on the body contacting side, the concave and convex portions are in face-to-face relationship (Figures 2 and 6).

As to claim 5, see Figure 6- the con-shaped convex/concave portions.

As to claim 12, see Figures 2-4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F. Stephens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jacqueline F Stephens/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3761